

### REMARKS

This application was originally filed on 9 March 2001 with twenty-four claims, two of which were written in independent form. No claims have been allowed.

The disclosure was objected to for various informalities. The applicant thanks the Examiner for the suggested corrections and has amended the specification as suggested.

Claims 1 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,311,223 to Bodin *et al.* ("Bodin") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,473,609 to Schwartz *et al.* ("Schwartz").

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, "an access device having a display unit and operable to wirelessly access HTML commands from a network and wirelessly transmit the content; and a display device comprising: a radio frequency receiver operable to receive the HTML commands from the access device."

Claim 12 has been amended to recite, "receiving network content, in the form of HTML commands, by means of a wireless receiver in an access device having a display unit; transmitting the HTML commands from the access device to a display device."

Bodin in view of Schwartz does not show, teach, or suggest these limitations.

Claims 2, 4, 10, 13, and 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bodin in view of Schwartz.

Claims 5, 11, 18, and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bodin in view of Schwartz and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,028,764 to Richardson *et al.* ("Richardson"). Claims 7-9 and 20-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bodin in view of Schwartz and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,663,560 to MacAulay *et al.* ("MacAulay"). Claims 6 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bodin in view of Schwartz and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,681,259 to Lemilainen *et al.* ("Lemilainen"). Claims 3, 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bodin in view of Schwartz and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,473,609 to Anderson ("Anderson"). Claim 24 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bodin in view of Schwartz and in further view of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/665,289 to Devins *et al.* ("Devins").

Claims 2-11 depend from Claim 1, and Claims 13-24 depend from Claim 12 and should be deemed allowable for that reason and on their own merits. For the reasons argued above with stated above with respect to Claims 1 and 12, the prior art of record does not show, teach, or suggest the limitations of the independent claims, much less the limitations of the independent claims in combination with the additional limitations of the dependent claims.

The present application claims priority from a provisional application filed 21 March 2000. MacAulay claims priority from three provisional applications, filed 17 December 1999, 24 March 2000, and 30 October 2000. Therefore it is not clear that MacAulay is prior art against this application.

In view of the amendments and the remarks presented herewith, it is believed that the claims currently in the application accord with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and are allowable over the prior art of record. Therefore, it is urged that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles A. Brill  
Reg. No. 37,786

Texas Instruments Incorporated  
PO Box 655474 M/S 3999  
Dallas, TX 75265  
(972) 917-4379  
FAX: (972) 917-4418